



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. VII., 1824-1831. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 374.)

The Writings of James Madison. Edited by GAILLARD HUNT. Vol. IV., 1787; The Journal of the Constitutional Convention, II. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xi, 551.)

MR. HAMILTON's seventh and concluding volume is melancholy reading. Whatever estimate may be placed on Monroe's intellect and capacity, he had, at the time of his retirement, served his country faithfully and in a highly honorable spirit for more than forty years. His conception of public responsibilities had been an exalted one; his ambitions had been lofty, and he had pursued them with an unusually scrupulous conscience and with a keen regard for the rights of others. That his last years should be harassed as they were by poverty and debt may have been no one's fault. That his pecuniary claims against the government, arising from his diplomatic missions, should have been settled in a spirit showing so little generosity toward him may have had its excuses, though it wears a disagreeable look. But that he should have been made almost constantly the victim of contemptible intrigues on the part of the baser sort of politicians, intended to benefit one or another of the presidential candidates at his expense, and that he should have found so few of the more important public men willing to act a manly part in defending him, casts an unhappy light upon the character of American politics at the time when democracy first obtained full swing. Whenever the thoughtful American is overcome with disgust of our parties, it may comfort him to look back to that brief period, grotesquely called the "Era of Good Feeling", when we had none.

It is true that Monroe "doth protest too much". The self-consciousness which had marked his earlier years, and which had been lessened by successful activity in high executive positions, recurred after his retirement; most of the letters in this volume are labored defenses of his political course. He had neither the philosophic temper which made retirement not uncongenial to Jefferson and Madison, nor their intellectual resources. He tries hard to do his duty as a visitor of the University of Virginia, and to get some satisfaction out of it; but is as helpless as the average modern college trustee in the face of intellectual or educational problems. Adams offers him a mission to Latin America, a considerable group offer him support toward a third election as governor of his state; but circumstances oblige him to decline. Even when he is given a place on the ticket for presidential electors, it is as a part of a small party intrigue. His name and Madison's are put on without their consent, and for six weeks, though the committee are their friends and are no farther away than Richmond, the ex-presidents cannot compel them to remove their names (pp. 125, 134, 144, 149-151). Mr. Hamil-

ton, indeed, thinks that Monroe is still ill-treated, alluding in a foot-note to "the petty rancor and partisan bitterness with which the memory and acts of James Monroe are so frequently and unjustifiably assailed by some historical writers"; but it is not apparent that there is any sufficient basis for this.

Among the most interesting of the letters are two (pp. 175, 187), addressed to Calhoun in August, 1828, and January, 1829, in which, out of mature experience, broad patriotism, and a kind heart, he gently but solemnly remonstrates against the South Carolina heresies of that summer. Besides the letters, the volume contains in its earlier pages several messages to Congress, and at the end a deposition denouncing the base insinuations made by John Rhea, and a reprint of Monroe's pamphlet *Memoir*, remarks and documents relating to his claims (Charlottesville, 1828).

Among these documents is a letter to Paine in 1794 and one to Talleyrand in 1803 (pp. 296, 304), which should have found their place in earlier volumes. By the way, there are printed in the appendix to the twentieth volume of the *Congressional Globe* some very interesting and important papers of Monroe relating to the Missouri Compromise, which ought to have been inserted in Volume VI. Pages 94 to 101 of the present volume mention thirty-two letters of 1814 and 1815 which Monroe thinks important toward the explanation of his conduct with reference to the New Orleans campaign. Nearly all are, or lately were, in the archives of the Department of State; Mr. Hamilton has printed only two of them. Outside that repository of Monroe papers he strays no more than in his first volume. The editing, too, remains upon the same level. There are in the whole volume hardly more than a score of editorial foot-notes, though many more were needed. It would take little trouble to learn (p. 114), that no Shay was professor at the University of Virginia, but that the reading must be Key. Of a similar sort, and of a sort often noticed in the review of previous volumes, are: p. 2, "a decisive *offset* in preventing", for *effect*; pp. 19, 20, *one* for *me* thrice, where *one* makes no sense; p. 32, "50° 40'", for the obvious 54° 40'; p. 131, "an *important* examination", for *impartial*. The volume concludes with indexes to the whole series, which seem excellent. It is pleasant to end upon a note of praise; for, though some criticisms have seemed to the reviewer unavoidable, it is impossible to take leave of this handsome and extensive series without a feeling of gratitude to the editor for the large amount of useful historical material with which he has presented us.

Mr. Hunt's fourth volume offers little opportunity for remark. It contains the second half of what he has unfortunately chosen to call the Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. There are almost no notes but Madison's own, found in the manuscript, and William Pierce's characterizations of members. A long note on the suffrage, printed on pp. 121-127, is not in the *Documentary History*. A facsimile of the first page of the Constitution in its engrossment is given. The volume ends with an index to Volumes III. and IV., of good quality, but less elaborate

than that presented in the *Documentary History*. It is accordingly to be presumed that Mr. Hunt intends these two volumes to have a separate existence and circulation from that of the rest of his series. This, as an accurate, legible, and intelligent edition of Madison's notes, they well deserve.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

The Creevey Papers; a Selection from the Correspondence and Diaries of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P. Born 1768; died 1838. Edited by the Right Hon. Sir HERBERT MAXWELL, Bart., M.P., LL.D., F.R.S. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: John Murray. 1903. Two vols., pp. xxiv, 342; x, 372.)

STUDENTS of English political history of the period extending from the French Revolution to the accession of Queen Victoria have good reason to congratulate themselves on the remarkable find which has been made by Sir Herbert Maxwell. They would be still more in Sir Herbert Maxwell's debt had he edited the Creevey letters, reminiscences, and journals with the care which their historical value and interest demand. The editing, however, has been done with scant claim to consistency and with little of the extreme care that marks the editing by the late Mr. L. J. Jennings of the *Croker Papers*, with which as regards historical value the *Creevey Papers* have been frequently compared. The period covered by the two sets of papers is practically the same. Both Croker and Creevey wrote much of George IV. and William IV. and of the Duke of Wellington. Both dealt with the downfall of the old Toryism, and the end of the unreformed House of Commons, and with the internal condition of the two great political parties in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Croker, however, with all his shortcomings, was a statesman as compared with Creevey; and he stood for something in the House of Commons. Creevey was also long of the House of Commons. He wrote a pamphlet in favor of parliamentary reform, and grouped himself with Radicals such as Whitbread, Romilly, and Hume. But he was of the House of Commons chiefly for the social advantages which accrued to him through his being there; and while he was intimate with all the leading Whig politicians from the time of Fox to the Melbourne ministry, he apparently carried no weight in their councils, and he certainly made no lasting reputation as a member. So much is this the case that there is no mention of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; and Sir Herbert Maxwell has done but little to trace out Creevey's career.

Creevey was of Irish extraction but was born in Liverpool, where his father was a merchant. He went to Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1786, and after taking his B.A. degree in 1789 he was admitted as a student at the Inner Temple. In 1791, while still a student, he transferred himself to Gray's Inn, and was finally called to the bar in June, 1794. While in Liverpool he had been a friend of Dr. Currie and William Roscoe; and from his association with these prominent members of the